

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 have been withdrawn. Claims 17-44 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Applicants have cancelled claims 24 and 25.

Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the interview held on April 4, 2008 with Ari Gilder and Han Gim. During the interview, Applicants discussed the above amendments and the references cited by the Examiner. Agreement was reached that the above amendments and following remarks appear to overcome the outstanding rejections. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner's comments are directed to claim 1 which is withdrawn. Applicants assume the comments are directed to claim 17. Claims 17, 36 and 44 are rejected because they recite an "opaque layer" that by definition contradicts the ability to propagate light. Applicants have amended claims 17, 36 and 44 to delete "opaque" and recite "transparent." Support for the amendment can be found at least in the specification paragraph 0045. During the interview the Examiner indicated that the amendments appear to overcome the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §101

The Examiner's comments are directed to claims 44 and 45. Applicants assume the comments are directed only to claim 44 as claim 45 has not been previously presented. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 USC §101 because "computer readable medium" may comprise a signal per se and does not fall within a category of patentable subject matter. Applicants have amended the claim to recite "A computer readable storage medium..." (emphasis added). Support for the amendment may be found at least in paragraph 0038, which describes "storage media" as including forms of volatile and/or nonvolatile memory. Modulated data signals are the subject of "communications media" as described in paragraph 0037 and are excluded from "storage

media.” During the interview the Examiner indicated that the amendments appear to overcome the rejection, pending further review. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

The Examiner’s comments are directed to claims 17-45. Applicants assume the comments are directed to claims 17-44 as claim 45 has not been previously presented. Claims 17-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by [TWEAKNEWS] – Computer Monitor and Displays Reviews (“Glentworth”). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

As amended, claim 17 now recites:

A computing device or peripheral in a computing system, comprising:
a housing comprising at least one lighting component and an opening for user display means or user input means; and
a transparent or translucent layer integrated with a substantial exterior portion of said housing and positioned to provide a secondary source of information viewable in the user’s workspace, whereby light emanating from the at least one lighting component propagates through said layer, said light generated according to a lighting scheme associated with a condition in the computing system or an alert from the computing system, the lighting scheme configurable by a user and synchronized among a plurality of communicatively coupled devices in a computing ecosystem.

The claim now recites that the transparent or translucent layer is positioned on the housing to provide a secondary source of information to the user. The claim now recites that the layer is integrated with a housing that includes an opening for an LCD or other display and provides a secondary source of information. See, for example, paragraph 0051 of the specification, which describes how a device as recited in claim 1 may, for example, provide a lighting scheme consistent with a system state event that is viewable to a user in the general vicinity of the user’s workspace. The claim further recites that the lighting scheme is configurable and synchronized among a plurality of communicatively coupled devices. Thus, for

example, a monitor, keyboard, and Bluetooth device incorporating such a layer may provide a unified lighting scheme indicating to the user that the system is in a powered state.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is not anticipated by Glentworth and is thus allowable. Independent claims 36 and 44 recite similar limitations as claim 1, and thus are allowable for similar reasons. Dependent claims 18-35 and 37-43 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from the allowable independent claims.

CONCLUSION

The applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the examiner in the Office Action, and submits that claims 17-44 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Should the examiner have any further suggestions for expediting the prosecution of the presently pending claims, the undersigned respectfully asks the examiner contact him at 206-332-1385.

Date: April 30, 2008

/Nathaniel Gilder/
Nathaniel Gilder
Registration No. 53,233

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439